



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,519	01/03/2002	Daniel Benjamin	ORT-1550	7332
27777	7590	07/25/2006	EXAMINER	
PHILIP S. JOHNSON JOHNSON & JOHNSON ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003			COOK, LISA V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1641	

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/037,519	Applicant(s) BENJAMIN ET AL.	
	Examiner Lisa V. Cook	Art Unit 1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/11/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Amendment Entry

1. Applicants' response to the Office Action mailed July 8, 2005 is acknowledged (Paper filed 1/11/06). In the amendment filed therein claims 1 and 4 were modified. Claims 5-8 have been canceled. Accordingly claims 1-4 are pending and under consideration.

2. Rejections and/or objections of record not reiterated below have been withdrawn.

OBJECTIONS WITHDRAWN

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the examiner on form PTO-892 or applicant on PTO-1449 has cited the references they have not been considered.

4. The information disclosure statement filed 14 May 2002 has been considered as to the merits before First Action.

5. The information disclosure statement filed 13 May 2003 has been considered as to the merits before First Action.

6. The information disclosure statement filed 11 January 2006 has been considered as to the merits before Final Action.

NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTIONS NECESSITATED BY AMENDMENT

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. The term "peptide fragment " in claim 1 is a relative term, which renders the claim indefinite. The term "peptide fragment" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. It is not clear as to what if any fragments would maintain the required activity of the enhancing peptide. Accordingly, claim 1 and claims dependent on claim 1 (claims 2-4) are not clear. It is suggested that the term "peptide fragment" be removed or replaced with the actual peptide sequences in order to obviate this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The written description in this case only sets forth SEQ ID NO:1, SEQ ID NO:2, SEQ ID NO:3, and SEQ ID NO:4; and therefore the written description is not commensurate in scope with the claims drawn to "peptide fragments" or the enhancing peptide.

It is noted that claim 1 and dependent claims 2-4 have been interpreted to be drawn to methods utilizing the fragments of SEQ ID NO:1, SEQ ID NO:2, SEQ ID NO:3, and SEQ ID NO:4. However no such fragments have been shown in the specification nor exemplified in the method as claimed. *Vas-Cath Inc. V. Mahurkar*, 19 USPQ2d 1111, clearly states that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*." (See page 1117). The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116).

Art Unit: 1641

Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 USC 112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 115).

Reiger et al (Glossary of Genetics and Cytogenetics, Classical and Molecular, 4th Ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976) clearly define alleles as one of two or more alternative forms of a gene occupying the same locus on a particular chromosome..... and differing from other alleles of that locus at one or more mutational sites (page 17). Thus, the structure of naturally occurring allelic sequences are not defined. With the exception of SEQ ID NO:1, SEQ ID NO:2, SEQ ID NO:3, and SEQ ID NO:4; the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed structure of the encompassed fragments and therefore conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and a reference to a potential method of isolating it. The polynucleotide itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ 2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016.

Furthermore, In *The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly* (43 USPQ2d 1398-1412), the court held that a generic statement which defines a genus of nucleic acids by only their functional activity does not provide an adequate written description of the genus. The court indicated that while Applicants are not required to disclose every species encompassed by a genus, the description of a genus is achieved by the recitation of a representative number of DNA molecules, usually defined by a nucleotide sequence, falling within the scope of the claimed genus.

Art Unit: 1641

At section B(1), the court states that "An adequate written description of a DNA...requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties', not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention".

No disclosure, beyond the mere mention of SEQ ID NO:1, SEQ ID NO:2, SEQ ID NO:3, and SEQ ID NO:4; is made in the specification. This is insufficient to support the claims drawn to the fragments thereof as provided by the Interim Written Description Guidelines published in the June 15, 1998 Federal Register at Volume 63, Number 114, pages 32639-32645.

Therefore only an isolated the sequence consisting of SEQ ID NO:1, SEQ ID NO:2, SEQ ID NO:3, and SEQ ID NO:4; but not the full breadth of the claims meets the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

REJECTIONS MAINTAINED

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1641

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

I. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Biere et al. (US Patent #6,184,351) in view of Murray et al. (Society for Neuroscience Abstracts, Vol.26, No.1-2, 2000 – Abstract No.-84.10) and LeVine (Protein Science, 1993, 2, 404-410).

Biere et al. teach aggregation assays measuring aggregated human recombinant NACP/I-synuclein (column 3 lines 3-18 and Gene Core sequence search – result 2) in the presence of a test compound.

In Biere's assay a pre aggregated alpha synuclein solution is added to the test sample and the change in fluorescent detection was measured at 280 nm - wavelength (as an indication of change in aggregation). See figure 3, column 2 lines 38-43, and column 8 lines 26-27. Multiple time points are measured to evaluate the change in aggregation (two different points in time). See figures 3 and 6, for examples.

The human recombinant NACP/I-synuclein composition taught by Biere et al. reads on claims 3 and 4 because the claims recite compositions comprising residues 61-90 of alpha synuclein = SEQ ID NO:3 or SEQ ID NO:4. Therefore, the full length 140 amino acid NACP/I-synuclein of Biere et al. includes SEQ ID NO:3 and SEQ ID NO:4.

Art Unit: 1641

Biere et al. differ from the instant invention in not specifically teaching fluorescent detection with Thioflavin T (Thio T) at about 484 or 485.

However, Murray et al. disclose an aggregation system detecting compounds that inhibit alpha synuclein aggregation. The results were detected via Thioflavin T. Murray et al. taught that Thioflavin-T appeared to compete with test compounds to inhibit alpha syn aggregation and this could be monitored by the fluorometry assay but not by centrifugation. See abstract.

While, LeVine discloses that Thioflavin T's association with aggregates produces an enhanced emission at 482 nm (about 484 or 485). See abstract and page 405 1st column.

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention utilize Thioflavin-T at about 484nm or 485nm wavelengths, in the pre-aggregated alpha synuclein fluorescent detection method taught by Biere et al. because Murray et al. taught that Thioflavin-T appeared to compete with test compounds to inhibit alpha syn aggregation and this could be monitored by the fluorometry assay but not by centrifugation. See abstract. While, Levine taught that Thioflavin-T produced an enhanced emission at 482 nm. See abstract and page 405 1st column.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ Thioflavin-T along with a test compound in a competitive method so that Thio T would serve not only as a positive marker (complete inhibition) but could also provide information of the test compounds interaction when other inhibitors are present. This would prove valuable in finding compounds to treating neurodegenerative illnesses exhibiting alpha syn aggregation (Parkinson disease/Alzheimer's disease). See Murray et al. abstract and LeVine page 404.

Art Unit: 1641

Response to Arguments

10. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., expedited aggregation of alpha synuclein) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Specifically, the claims merely require the aggregation of alpha synuclein in the presence of an alpha synuclein containing a synthetic peptide or peptide fragment. Accordingly, the claims read on the prior art assays employing synthetic alpha synuclein peptides aggregates, which are evaluated for hundreds of hours or days. See Biere et al. (US Patent #6,184,351), column 4 lines 12-18 and column 9 – example 5 wherein artificial (synthetic) alpha synuclein mutants are employed *in vitro* aggregation assays.

Applicant contends that the claimed method utilizes *enhancing peptides* to expedite the rate of the alpha synuclein aggregation assay and the assays of the cited prior art are prolonged. This argument was carefully considered but not found persuasive because the cited art employs the same enhancing peptides in alpha synuclein aggregation assay (See Biere's wherein aggregated alpha synuclein solution is added to the test sample and the change in fluorescent detection was measured at 280 nm - wavelength (as an indication of change in aggregation). See figure 3, column 2 lines 38-43, and column 8 lines 26-27.

Art Unit: 1641

Applicants argue that the prior art does not teach assays that separately provide synthetic peptides or peptide fragments of 61-90 and 61-75 of alpha synuclein to enhance the aggregation of alpha synuclein solution. In other words the prior art does not employ the synthetic peptides in assay procedures for improved aggregation. This argument was carefully considered but not found persuasive because Biere et al. disclose enhanced aggregation with a synthetic construct designated H50Y/A53T. See column 4 lines 12-19 and lines 43-47. This H50Y/A53T comprises SEQ ID NO:3 of claims 3 and 4. See GeneCore Search Results dated December 9, 2004.

Applicant contends that the prior art does not teach separately adding enhancing peptides. However, Biere et al. teach the separate addition of mutant (synthetic) alpha synuclein as seeds to aggregation-competent, supersaturated solutions of wild type alpha synuclein in order to bypass the lag phase and cause rapid aggregation (enhancing peptides). See column 8 lines 34-42.

Also, the claims do not indicate a shorter time course for assay progression but merely read on an incubation of sufficient time to allow for a change in aggregation state (claim 1 step (b)). In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., shorter time course than the prior art methods) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

11. For reasons aforementioned, no claims are allowed.

Art Unit: 1641

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

13. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform to the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Group 1641 – Central Fax number is (571) 273-8300, which is able to receive transmissions 24 hours/day, 7 days/week. In the event Applicant would like to fax an unofficial communication, the Examiner should be contacted for the appropriate Right Fax number.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lisa V. Cook whose telephone number is (571) 272-0816. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 AM - 4:00 PM.

Art Unit: 1641

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le, can be reached on (571) 272-0823.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 1600 whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Lisa V. Cook
Remsen 3C-59
(571) 272-0816
7/18/06



LONG V. LE 07/20/06
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600